

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/228,710	01/11/1999	SIMON CHOULDJIAN	17789-000200	8207
75	90 01/25/2005		EXAM	INER
STEPHEN Y I	PANG	BRINEY III, WALTER F		
TOWNSEND A	ND TOWNSEND AND	CREW		
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
8TH FLOOR			2644	
SAN FRANCIS	CO, CA 941113834			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/228,710	CHOULDJIAN ET AL.			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Walter F Briney III	2644			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2004 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	evoid abandonment of this applic 1) a timely filed amendment whi al (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date o	-				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mote armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI Ite on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee the see. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:				
(a) Methey raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	:				
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)				
10. Other:		HUYEN LE PRIMARY EXAMINER			

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the newly added limitations to claims 1, 9, and 18 were neither previously indicated by the examiner as being allowable nor previously presented. In particular, the prior limitations were directed toward the fact that all telephones had separate circuits, but did not exclude a connection to a common line, which has now been indicated as beyond the scope of the claims.

VHUYEN LE PRIMARY EXAMINER